

REMARKS

The office action of 26 September 2005 has been reviewed and its contents carefully noted. Claims 1 and 19 are amended by this response. Reconsideration of this case, as amended, is requested.

Objections to the Abstract

The Abstract has been objected to for excessive length. Applicant has acceded to this objection by amending and shortening the abstract, supra. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Restriction Requirement and Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 19 for double patenting over the parent case (now U.S. Patent No. 6,619,244) under 35 U.S.C. §101. In order to avoid this ground for rejection, applicant has amended claims 1 and 19 to incorporate additional limitations based on allowable claims 2 and 3. Thus, claims 1 and 19 can no longer be claimed to be identical to the cited claims in '244. Moreover, as there are now allowable generic claims linking claims 15 and 17 to the other claims, the basis for restriction on these claims has also been overcome. Thus, applicant believes that, with these amendments, all of the claims now recite patentable subject matter and are thus allowable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection and restriction are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2 through 14, 16, 18, 20 and 21 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant gratefully acknowledges Examiner's statement that these claims are allowable. However, in lieu of the amendment suggested, applicant has amended the base claims so as to incorporate allowable subject matter from claims 2 and 3. The base claims are, therefore, no longer objectionable under 35 U.S.C. 101. Thus, these claims should remain allowable as well

as the remaining claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.


Conclusion

Applicant believes the claims, as amended, are patentable over the prior art, and that this case is now in condition for allowance of all claims therein. Such action is thus respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees, or believes for any other reason that direct contact with Applicants' attorney would advance the prosecution of the case to finality, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Recognizing that Internet communications are not secured, I hereby authorize the PTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file.

Respectfully Submitted:

Patrick C. Ho

By: 

Steven R. Scott, Reg. No. 32,000
Attorney for Applicant
BROWN & MICHAELS, P.C.
400 M&T Bank Building - 118 N. Tioga St.
Ithaca, NY 14850
(607) 256-2000 • (607) 256-3628 (fax)
e-mail: docket@bpmllegal.com

Dated: December 6, 2005